arXiv:hep-th/9812179v2 4 Jan 1999

On the Implementation of Supersymmetry

Dedicated to Jan Łopuszanski

Detlev Buchholz

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Göttingen,
Bunsenstraße 9, D-37073 Göttingen, Germany

Abstract

The implementation of supersymmetry transformations by Hilbert space operators is discussed in the framework of supersymmetric C*–dynamical systems. It is shown that the only states admitting such an implementation are pure supersymmetric ground states or mixtures and elementary excitations thereof. Faithful states, such as KMS–states, are never supersymmetric.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry is an intriguing mathematical concept which has become a basic ingredient in many branches of modern theoretical physics. In spite of its still lacking physical evidence, its far–reaching theoretical implications uphold the believe that supersymmetry plays a prominent role in the fundamental laws of nature.

As for the theory of elementary particles, the possible manifestations of unbroken supersymmetry have been fully clarified by Haag, Łopuszanski and Sohnius [1, 2]. On the other hand it is known that supersymmetry is inevitably broken in thermal states. As a matter of fact, this breakdown is much stronger than that of internal bosonic symmetries: one may speak of a spontaneous collapse of supersymmetry [3].

These facts seem to indicate that supersymmetry is only implementable in states describing elementary systems. It is the aim of the present article to clarify this point for general C*–dynamical systems. Apart from supersymmetry, the only ingredient in our analysis is the assumption that the dynamics is asymptotically abelian (see below for precise definitions). So our framework covers also non–local theories.

We shall show in the subsequent section that supersymmetric states are always ground states. If these states are mixed (not pure), they can be decomposed into pure states which are also supersymmetric. At the other extreme, faithful states (such as KMS–states) are never supersymmetric. States which are not supersymmetric but still admit an implementation of the supersymmetry transformations by Hilbert space operators coincide asymptotically with supersymmetric ground states and may thus be regarded as excitations thereof. The physical significance of these results is discussed in the conclusions.

2 Implementations of odd derivations

We discuss in this section the consequences of unbroken supersymmetry. As our results do not rely on a specific physical interpretation we present them in the general mathematical setting of C*–dynamical systems [4].

Definition: Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_+ \oplus \mathcal{F}_-$ be a graded C*–algebra, let α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$ which respects the grading and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be the dense subalgebra of analytic elements with respect to the action of α. The dynamical system $(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)$ is said to be supersymmetric if the (skew symmetric) generator of α

$$\delta_0 \doteq -i \frac{d}{dt} \alpha_t \mid_{t=0} \tag{2.1}$$

can be represented in the form

$$\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta \cdot \overline{\delta} + \overline{\delta} \cdot \delta), \tag{2.2}$$

where δ is a closable odd derivation which is defined on $\mathcal{A}$ and commutes with α, and the associated linear map $\overline{\delta}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ is fixed by

$$\overline{\delta}(F_\pm) \doteq \mp\, \delta(F_\pm{}^*)^* \tag{2.3}$$

for $F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm \doteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{F}_\pm$.

The even and odd parts $\mathcal{F}_\pm$ of $\mathcal{F}$ may be interpreted as the Bose and Fermi parts of some field algebra. There holds in particular $\mathcal{F}_+ \cdot \mathcal{F}_- = \mathcal{F}_- \cdot \mathcal{F}_+ \subset \mathcal{F}_-$ and $\mathcal{F}_\pm \cdot \mathcal{F}_\pm \subset \mathcal{F}_+$. We recall that an odd derivation is a densely defined linear mapping which maps even operators into odd ones and *vice versa*, and which satisfies the graded Leibniz rule

$$\delta(F_\pm\, G) = \delta(F_\pm)\, G \pm \; F_\pm\, \delta(G) \tag{2.4}$$

for $F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$ and $G \in \mathcal{A}$. It is easily checked that $\overline{\delta}$ is also an odd derivation.

Note that the right hand side of relation (2.2) always defines an even derivation. Hence, given δ, one can determine a corresponding δ_0 and if the latter derivation is sufficiently well behaved it is the generator of a group of automorphisms α satisfying relation (2.1) [4, Ch. 3.4]. In this sense the whole structure is fixed by δ. We turn now to the analysis of supersymmetric states.

Definition: A state ω on $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be supersymmetric if $\omega \cdot \delta = 0$.

The following result on the implementability of derivations in representations induced by symmetric states is well known in the even case [4]. Its straightforward generalization to odd derivations is given here for completeness.

Lemma 2.1 *Let ω be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ and let $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ be its induced GNS–representation. The operator Q given by*

$$Q\, \pi(F)\, \Omega \doteq \pi(\delta(F))\, \Omega \quad \textit{for} \quad F \in \mathcal{A} \tag{2.5}$$

is well defined and closable. Moreover, there holds on its domain $\pi(\mathcal{A})\, \Omega$

$$\pi(\delta(F_\pm)) = Q\pi(F_\pm) \mp \pi(F_\pm)Q \quad \textit{for} \quad F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof: By relation (2.4) and the supersymmetry of ω there holds for any $F \in \mathcal{A}$ and $G_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$

$$\begin{aligned}(\pi(G_\pm)\,\Omega,\, \pi(\delta(F))\,\Omega) &= \omega({G_\pm}^*\,\delta(F)) = \omega(\mp\,\delta({G_\pm}^*)\,F) \\ &= (\pi(\mp\,\delta({G_\pm}^*)^*)\,\Omega,\, \pi(F)\,\Omega) \\ &= (\pi(\overline{\delta}(G_\pm))\,\Omega,\, \pi(F)\,\Omega). \qquad (2.7)\end{aligned}$$

As in the case of even derivations one concludes from this equality that Q is a well defined linear operator which is closable. In fact, its adjoint Q^* is also defined on $\pi(\mathcal{A})\,\Omega$ and $Q^*\,\pi(F)\,\Omega = \pi(\overline{\delta}(F))\,\Omega$, $F \in \mathcal{A}$. The second part of the statement follows from relations (2.4) and (2.5) after a routine computation. □

Next we show, by making use of arguments in [3], that supersymmetric states are ground states with respect to the group α. If they are mixed, all states appearing in their decomposition are also supersymmetric.

Proposition 2.2 *Let ω be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$. Then the group of automorphisms α is implemented in the corresponding GNS–representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ by a continuous unitary group U with positive generator and Ω is invariant under the action of U. If ω is a mixed state, any component (sub–ensemble) $\omega_<$ appearing in its decomposition is also supersymmetric.*

Proof: As $\omega \cdot \delta = 0$ there holds $\omega \cdot \overline{\delta} = 0$, hence $\omega \cdot \delta_0 = 0$. It therefore follows from standard arguments that α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is implemented by a continuous unitary group $U(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, which leaves Ω invariant. Now for any $\sigma, \tau \in \{\pm\}$ and $F_\sigma \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$, $G_\tau \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta({F_\sigma}^*\,\overline{\delta}(G_\tau)) &= \delta\,({F_\sigma}^*)\,\overline{\delta}(G_\tau) + \sigma\,{F_\sigma}^*\,(\delta\cdot\overline{\delta}\,(G_\tau)) \\ &= -\sigma\,\overline{\delta}\,(F_\sigma)^*\,\overline{\delta}(G_\tau) + \sigma\,{F_\sigma}^*\,(\delta\cdot\overline{\delta}\,(G_\tau)), \qquad (2.8)\end{aligned}$$

and consequently $\omega({F_\sigma}^*\,(\delta\cdot\overline{\delta}\,(G_\tau))) = \omega(\overline{\delta}(F_\sigma)^*\,\overline{\delta}(G_\tau))$. By interchanging the role of δ and $\overline{\delta}$ we also get $\omega({F_\sigma}^*\,(\overline{\delta}\cdot\delta\,(G_\tau))) = \omega(\delta(F_\sigma)^*\,\delta(G_\tau))$. Since $\delta, \overline{\delta}$ are linear we conclude that for $F \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(F^*\delta_0(F)) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\,\omega(F^*(\delta\cdot\overline{\delta}\,(F))) + \tfrac{1}{2}\,\omega(F^*(\overline{\delta}\cdot\delta\,(F))) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\,\omega(\overline{\delta}(F)^*\,\overline{\delta}(F)) + \tfrac{1}{2}\,\omega(\delta(F)^*\,\delta(F)) \geq 0, \qquad (2.9)\end{aligned}$$

proving that the generator of U is a positive selfadjoint operator [4, Ch. 4.2].

Next, if $t \mapsto f(t)$ is any absolutely integrable function whose Fourier transform has support in $\mathbb{R}_-$ and if $F \in \mathcal{F}$ we put $\alpha_f(F) \doteq \int dt\, f(t)\,\alpha_t(F)$. Since $t \mapsto \alpha_t(F)$ is strongly continuous there holds $\alpha_f(F) \in \mathcal{F}$. It follows from the preceding result that $\omega(\alpha_f(F)^*\,\alpha_f(F)) = 0$. Hence if $\omega_< \leq c\cdot\omega$ for some positive constant c, there holds $\omega_<(\alpha_f(F)^*\,\alpha_f(F)) = 0$ and consequently $\omega_<$ is also invariant under the action of α. Setting $F_T \doteq T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\,\alpha_t(F)$, $F \in \mathcal{A}$, we get $\omega_<(\delta(F)) = \omega_<(\delta(F)_T) = \omega_<(\delta(F_T))$ and making use of relation (2.9) we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}|\omega_<(\delta(F))|^2 &= |\omega_<(\delta(F_T))|^2 \leq \omega_<(\delta(F_T)^*\,\delta(F_T)) \\ &\leq c\cdot\omega(\delta(F_T)^*\,\delta(F_T)) + c\cdot\omega(\overline{\delta}(F_T)^*\,\overline{\delta}(F_T)) \\ &= 2c\cdot\omega(F_T^*\,\delta_0(F_T)). \qquad (2.10)\end{aligned}$$

As $\delta_0(F_T) = -iT^{-1}(\alpha_T(F) - F)$, the right hand side of this inequality tends to 0 as $T \to \infty$ and the assertion follows. □

The following proposition is a straightforward consequence of this result.

Proposition 2.3 *If ω is a faithful state on $\mathcal{F}$ and $\delta \neq 0$, there holds $\omega \cdot \delta \neq 0$.*

Proof: If $\omega \cdot \delta = 0$, it follows from the preceding proposition that for any absolutely integrable function f whose Fourier transform has support in $\mathbb{R}_-$ and any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ there holds $\omega(\alpha_f(F)^* \alpha_f(F)) = 0$. Since ω is faithful this implies $\alpha_f(F) = 0$ and $\alpha_{\overline{f}}(F^*) = \alpha_f(F)^* = 0$. As the Fourier transform of the complex conjugate $\overline{f}$ of f has support in $\mathbb{R}_+$ and f, F are arbitrary we arrive at $\alpha_f(F) = 0$ whenever the Fourier transform of f does not contain 0 in its support. Hence $\alpha_t(F) = F$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and consequently $\delta_0 = 0$. Because of relation (2.9) this implies $\omega(\delta(F)^*\delta(F)) = 0$ for all $F \in \mathcal{A}$. But this is incompatible with the assumption that ω is faithful and $\delta \neq 0$. Hence $\omega \cdot \delta \neq 0$. □

More can be said if there acts on $\mathcal{F}$ some group of automorphisms in an asymptotically abelian manner. In order to simplify the discussion we assume that α itself has this property and indicate below which of the subsequent results hold more generally.

Definition: The group α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is said to act on $\mathcal{F}$ in an asymptotically abelian manner (shortly: it is asymptotically abelian) if

$$||\alpha_t(F_\pm)\, G_\pm \mp G_\pm\, \alpha_t(F_\pm)|| \to 0 \tag{2.11}$$

for $F_\pm, G_\pm \in \mathcal{F}_\pm$ and $|t| \to \infty$.

A well known consequence of asymptotic abelianess is the following result on the asymptotic behaviour of averages of odd operators [3, 6].

Lemma 2.4 *Let α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be asymptotically abelian. Then*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} ||T^{-1} \int_0^T dt\, \alpha_t(F_-)|| = 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad F_- \in \mathcal{F}_-. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof: Since for $F \in \mathcal{F}$ there holds $||F||^2 = ||F^*F|| \leq ||F^*F + FF^*||$ we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} ||T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\, \alpha_t(F_-)||^2 &\leq ||T^{-2}\int_0^T dt \int_0^T dt'\, (\alpha_t(F_-)^*\alpha_{t'}(F_-) + \alpha_{t'}(F_-)\alpha_t(F_-)^*)|| \\ &\leq T^{-2}\int_0^T dt \int_{-T}^T dt'\, ||F_-{}^*\, \alpha_{t'}(F_-) + \alpha_{t'}(F_-)\, F_-{}^*||. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

According to relation (2.11) the norm under the integral on the right hand side of this inequality tends to 0 if $|t'| \to \infty$, so the statement follows. □

With these preparations we can establish now more detailed information on the representations induced by supersymmetric states. Our result relies on familiar arguments in algebraic quantum field theory [4].

Proposition 2.5 *Let the group $\alpha_t, t \in \mathbb{R}$, be asymptotically abelian. If the state ω is supersymmetric, the GNS–representation π of $\mathcal{F}$ induced by ω is of type I. More specifically, the commutant $\pi(\mathcal{F})'$ of $\pi(\mathcal{F})$ coincides with the center of $\pi(\mathcal{F})''$.*

Proof: According to Proposition 2.2 the automorphisms α are implemented in the GNS–representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ by a continuous unitary group U with positive generator, and Ω is invariant under the action of U. Hence $U(t) \in \pi(\mathcal{F})''$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by a theorem of Araki [4, Ch. 2.4]. Let E_0 be the projection onto the U–invariant subspace in $\mathcal{H}$. The statement follows if $E_0\pi(\mathcal{F})E_0$ can be shown to be a commutative family [4, Prop. 2.4.11]. Now by the preceding Lemma there holds for $F_- \in \mathcal{F}_-$

$$E_0\,\pi(F_-)E_0 = E_0\,\pi(\ T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\,\alpha_t(F_-))E_0 \to 0 \tag{2.14}$$

as $T \to \infty$ and consequently $E_0\,\pi(\mathcal{F}_-)E_0 = 0$. Similarly, if $F_+, G_+ \in \mathcal{F}_+$, we obtain from relation (2.11) by standard arguments (mean ergodic theorem)

$$[E_0\,\pi(F_+)E_0, E_0\,\pi(G_+)E_0] = \lim_{T\to\infty} T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\,E_0\,\pi([F_+, \alpha_t(G_+)])E_0 = 0, \tag{2.15}$$

where the convergence is understood in the weak operator topology. □

The preceding result and the second part of Proposition 2.2 imply that any supersymmetric state is a pure supersymmetric ground state or a mixture of such states. Hence supersymmetric states describe the most elementary systems of the theory. Next we analyze the class of states which are not supersymmetric but still admit an implementation of supersymmetry transformation by Hilbert space operators.

Definition: A state ω on $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be super–regular if δ is implementable in its GNS–representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$, i.e., if there is some densely defined, closed operator Q on $\mathcal{H}$ such that there holds in the sense of sesquilinear forms

$$\pi(\delta(F_\pm)) = Q\pi(F_\pm) \mp \pi(F_\pm)Q \quad \text{for} \quad F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm. \tag{2.16}$$

Note that it is not required that Ω is contained in the domain of Q.

In order to proceed we need the following technical result which seems of interest in its own right. In its proof we apply similar arguments as in the analysis of even derivations in [5].

Lemma 2.6 *If ω is a super–regular state on $\mathcal{F}$, there is for any $\varepsilon > 0$ a constant c_ε such that for all $F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$*

$$|\,\omega(\delta(F_\pm))| \leq c_\varepsilon(||\pi(F_\pm)\Omega|| + ||\pi(F_\pm{}^*)\Omega||) + \varepsilon(||\delta(F_\pm)|| + ||\overline{\delta}(F_\pm)||). \tag{2.17}$$

Proof: We begin by recalling that if Q is a densely defined, closed operator its adjoint Q^* has the same property and the operators QQ^* and Q^*Q are selfadjoint and positive. From the equality

$$(\Phi, \pi(\overline{\delta}(F_\pm))\Psi) = \mp\,\overline{(\Psi, \pi(\delta(F_\pm{}^*)\Phi))}\,, \tag{2.18}$$

where $F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$ and Φ, Ψ are vectors in the domains of Q and Q^*, respectively, it follows that $\overline{\delta}$ is also implementable and

$$\overline{\delta}(F_\pm) = Q^* F_\pm \mp F_\pm Q^* \tag{2.19}$$

in the sense of sesquilinear forms. Putting for $\eta > 0$

$$L_\eta \doteq (1 + i\eta\, QQ^*)^{-1}, \quad R_\eta \doteq (1 + i\eta\, Q^*Q)^{-1} \tag{2.20}$$

it is clear that L_η, R_η as well as $L_\eta Q \subset (Q^* L_\eta^*)^*$ and QR_η are bounded operators. Moreover, by making use of relations (2.16) and (2.19) one finds after a straightforward computation that for $F_\pm \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$

$$L_\eta Q\, \pi(F_\pm) \mp \pi(F_\pm)\, QR_\eta = L_\eta\, \pi(\delta(F_\pm))\, R_\eta \mp i\eta\, L_\eta Q\, \pi(\overline{\delta}(F_\pm))\, QR_\eta. \tag{2.21}$$

Now with the help of the spectral theorem one sees that the norms of the vectors $\eta^{1/2}\, QR_\eta\, \Omega$, $\eta^{1/2}\, (L_\eta Q)^*\, \Omega$, $(1 - R_\eta)\, \Omega$ and $(1 - L_\eta)^*\, \Omega$ tend to 0 as $\eta \to 0$. Thus by taking matrix elements of relation (2.21) in the state Ω and applying to the left hand side of the resulting equation the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one arrives at the statement. □

We can now establish the following result about the asymptotic properties of super–regular states.

Proposition 2.7 *Let α_t, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be asymptotically abelian. If ω is a super–regular state on $\mathcal{F}$, there holds (point-wise on $\mathcal{A}$)*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\; T^{-1} \int_0^T dt\, \omega\alpha_t \cdot \delta = 0. \tag{2.22}$$

In particular, all limit points of the net of states $\{T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\, \omega\alpha_t\}_{T>0}$ for $T \to \infty$ are supersymmetric.

Proof: Because of Lemma 2.4 we have $T^{-1}\int_0^T dt\, \omega\alpha_t(F_-) \to 0$ for $F_- \in \mathcal{F}_-$ and $T \to \infty$ and since δ is an odd derivation it follows that (2.22) holds on $\mathcal{A}_+$. If $F_- \in \mathcal{A}_-$, we put $F_{-_T} \doteq T^{-1} \int_0^T dt\, \alpha_t(F_-)$ and obtain with the help of the preceding lemma the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\, T^{-1} \int_0^T dt\, \omega\alpha_t \cdot \delta(F_-)| &= |\omega \cdot \delta(F_{-_T})| \\ &\leq c_\varepsilon\, (||\pi(F_{-_T})\Omega|| + ||\pi(F_{-_T}{}^*)\Omega||) + \varepsilon\, (||\delta(F_{-_T})|| + ||\overline{\delta}(F_{-_T})||) \\ &\leq 2c_\varepsilon\, ||F_{-_T}|| + \varepsilon\, (||\delta(F_-)|| + ||\overline{\delta}(F_-)||), \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where, in the final step, we made use of the fact that δ and $\overline{\delta}$ are linear and of the triangle inequality. Applying Lemma 2.4 another time we see that the first term on the right hand side of this inequality vanishes in the limit $T \to \infty$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary the statement follows. □

This result shows that if there exist in a theory super–regular states there exist also supersymmetric ground states which asymptotically approximate the regular ones. In particular, any α–invariant super–regular state is supersymmetric.

In the proof of these results we made use of the assumption that α is asymptotically abelian, but this condition can be relaxed. It suffices if there is some group of automorphisms β which acts on $\mathcal{F}$ in an asymptotically abelian manner and commutes with δ. If one replaces in the formulations of Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.7 the group α by any such β, the resulting statements hold as well.

3 Conclusions

In the preceding analysis we have seen that the implementation of supersymmetry transformations by Hilbert space operators can be accomplished only in a very special class of states. We want to discuss here the physical implications of this observation.

In order to fix ideas let us assume that we are dealing with a theory with an asymptotically abelian time evolution which commutes with the supersymmetry transformation δ (yet it need not necessarily coincide with α). There then emerges the following general picture from our results: According to Proposition 2.3 no thermal state is symmetric with respect to the action of δ, for thermal states are faithful as a consequence of the KMS–condition. This holds therefore *a fortiori* for any mixture of such states. Furthermore, the action of supersymmetry cannot be implemented by operators on the corresponding state spaces (thermal states are not super–regular). This follows from Proposition 2.7, respectively its generalization mentioned at the end of the preceding section, according to which any super–regular state which is invariant under the time evolution is also supersymmetric. We may therefore state:

(a) Thermal states and their mixtures are neither supersymmetric nor do they admit the implementation of supersymmetries by Hilbert space operators.

The fact that one cannot restore supersymmetry in thermal states by proceeding to suitable mixtures was termed spontaneous collapse in [3]. Our present results are slightly more general than those in the latter article since they hold without the assumption that the supersymmetry transformation δ is related to the generator of the time evolution.

It is another intriguing consequence of Proposition 2.7 that all super–regular states coincide at asymptotic times with stationary mixtures of supersymmetric states. The latter states in turn are, by Proposition 2.2 and 2.5, mixtures of pure (and hence in their respective representations unique) supersymmetric states which can be distinguished by central observables (macroscopic order parameters). This general result provides evidence to the effect that the asymptotic limits of super–regular states are vacuum states.

In order to substantiate this idea let us consider the pertinent examples of supersymmetry in particle physics [2]. There the generator δ_0 of the time evolution can be expressed, in any given Lorentz system, by two odd derivations δ_1, δ_2 which commute

with space and time translations,

$$\delta_0 = \tfrac{1}{4}(\delta_1 \cdot \overline{\delta_1} + \overline{\delta_1} \cdot \delta_1) + \tfrac{1}{4}(\delta_2 \cdot \overline{\delta_2} + \overline{\delta_2} \cdot \delta_2). \tag{3.1}$$

If the spatial translations act on the field algebra in an asymptotically abelian manner (which is the case if this algebra is generated by local fields), it follows from Proposition 2.7, respectively its generalization, that all states which are super–regular with respect to δ_1 and δ_2 coincide in asymptotic spacelike directions with supersymmetric states. The latter states are, by Proposition 2.2, ground states for the time evolution, and this holds in all Lorentz frames [3]. Hence these states are relativistic vacuum states which can be decomposed into pure vacuum states. (The requirement of asymptotic abelianess of the time evolution is not needed here [4, Ch. 2.4].) We can summarize these results as follows:

(b) States admitting the implementation of supersymmetry agree in spacelike asymptotic regions with (mixtures of) pure supersymmetric vacuum states.

Hence in a supersymmetric theory all super–regular states are excitations of vacuum states and therefore describe only elementary systems. More complex systems do not admit an action of supersymmetry.

We are led by these results to the conclusion that supersymmetry is extremely vulnerable to thermal effects and there is no way of restoring the broken symmetry by physical operations on the states. In contrast, such a restoration can in general be accomplished quite easily in the case of broken bosonic symmetries: given a non–isotropic system such as a ferromagnet, say, one can prepare a corresponding rotational invariant (mixed) state by rotating the probe. As we have seen, there is no corresponding symmetry enhancing operation in the case of supersymmetry.

In view of these facts one may wonder how supersymmetry manifests itself in complex physical systems, such as the presumed early supersymmetric stages of the universe, where matter has been in a hot thermal imbroglio. It may well be that the presence of supersymmetry at the microscopic level of fields has no clearly visible consequences for such states. From the theoretical viewpoint this vulnerability of supersymmetry may be a virtue, however. First, it could explain why it is so difficult to establish this symmetry experimentally, should it be present in nature. Second, it might be used to distinguish in the theoretical setting preferred states by imposing supersymmetry as a selection criterion.

Thinking for example of quantum field theory on curved spacetime manifolds which do not admit a global time evolution (future directed Killing vector field), the notion of vacuum state becomes meaningless. But there might still exist in such theories some distinguished odd derivation. One could then characterize the preferred states and their corresponding folia by demanding that they be symmetric with respect to its action. The results of the preceding analysis would justify the view that such states describe the most elementary systems of the theory.

This idea suggests the following mathematical question whose solution is known in the case of even derivations [4, Prop. 3.2.18]: Under which conditions do there exist for an odd derivation on some graded C^*–algebra states which are annihilated by it? We hope that the present results will stimulate some interest in this problem.

References

[1] R. Haag, J. Łopuszanski and M. Sohnius, "All possible generators of supersymmetries of the S-matrix", Nucl. Phys. **B88** (1975) 257

[2] J. Łopuszanski, *An introduction to symmetry and supersymmetry in quantum field theory*, World Scientific 1991

[3] D. Buchholz and I. Ojima, "Spontaneous collapse of supersymmetry", Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997) 228

[4] S. Sakai, *Operator Algebras in Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press 1991

[5] D. Buchholz, S. Doplicher, R. Longo and J.E. Roberts, "A new look at Goldstone's theorem", Rev. Math. Phys. **Special Issue** (1992) 47

[6] H. Narnhofer and W. Thirring, "Clustering for algebraic K systems", Lett. Math. Phys. **30** (1994) 307